

## **REMARKS**

In response to the above Office Action, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the following features:

- 1) the golf club head has a side portion connected to the face, crown and sole portions;
- 2) a side member of the side portion has an edge which is bent to a side of the crown portion to provide an extension portion extending in the crown portion to form a part thereof;
- 3) a face member of the face portion has an edge which is bent to a side of the crown portion to provide an extension portion extending in the crown portion to form a part thereof; and
- 4) the first outer shell member is joined to the extension portions from an outside of a hollow region formed by the face portion, the crown portion, the side portion and the sole portion.

In addition, claim 3 has been amended to include features 1) - 3).

Support for feature 1) can be found on page 13, lines 8-16 of the specification.

Support for features 2) and 3) can be found on page 13, line 17 to page 14, line 1 of the specification and support for feature 4) in Figure 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Lee (U.S. 2003/0186760) in view of Kouno (US 2003/0013548).

However, Lee does not describe any extension portion of the side portion as claimed. Further, the fiber wall 35 in Lee is formed by resin-impregnated fiber sheet and integrally forms a crown with the side. Accordingly, Lee does not provide any

extension portion extending in the crown portion by bending an edge of a member of the side portion and the face portion to a side of the crown portion and forming a part of the crown portion. Furthermore, Lee forms the crown integrally with the side and thus does not join the first outer shell member to the extension portions of the side portion and the face portion.

While Kouno describes an extension portion in the face portion of the golf club head, it does not show any extension portion in a side portion.

Moreover, Kouno does not disclose that the first outer shell member is joined to the extension portions of the side portion and the face portion from an outside of a hollow region formed by the face portion, the crown portion, the side portion and the sole portion.

In view of this, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious from Lee and Kouno to have an extension portion of the side portion and join the first outer shell member to the extension portions of the side portion and face portion from the outside of the hollow region.

Furthermore, neither Lee nor Kouno disclose the claimed “equivalent rigidity” defined by a product of an elastic modulus in the direction in which a striking surface is oriented and a thickness nor the relationship between the equivalent rigidities of the sole portion and the crown portion as set forth in the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is submitted that neither claim 1 or claim 10 or claim 9 dependent from claim 1 are obvious over this cited combination of references.

Regarding claim 3, it is believed this is also not obvious in view of Lee or Kouno for the same reasons expressed above except for the argument that the “first outer shell

member is joined to the extension portions from an outside of the hollow region,” because this is not a limitation of claim 3.

Regarding claim 6, it is not understood why this is included in the rejection because it depends from claim 4 and claim 4 has not been included in the rejection. In any event, claim 6 ultimately depends from claim 3, so even if claim 4 was mistakenly excluded, it is not believed to be obvious for the same reasons expressed above with respect to claim 3.

In addition, claims 3-5, 11 and 12 were rejected over Lee in view of Kouno and Davis. However, it is believed claim 3 and claims 4-5 dependent therefrom and claims 11 and 12 dependent from claim 10 are patentable for the same reasons expressed above, because Davis does not show what is missing in Lee or Kouno and is set forth in claims 3 and 10, namely, the extension portion of the side portion and the extension portion of the face portion.

New claim 14, dependent on claim 3, includes the limitation that “the first outer shell member is joined to the extension portions (of the side portion and face portion) from an outside of a hollow region formed by the face portion, the crown portion, the side portion and the sole portion.” None of Kouno, Lee and Davis show joining the first outer shell member to the extension portions of the side portion and face portion from outside of the hollow region. Accordingly, it is believed claim 14 is patentable over the cited references.

Finally, new dependent claims 13, 15 and 16 define that the rigidity is lower in the sole portion than the crown portion. Neither of Lee nor Kouno describes or suggests

that the rigidity is lower in the sole portion than the crown portion. Accordingly, it is believed claims 13, 15 and 16 are also patentable over the cited references.

It is believed claims 1, 3-6 and 9-16 are in condition for allowance.

It is noted that the Examiner has not returned an acknowledged copy of the Information Disclosure Statements filed August 13, 2007 or October 31, 2007. It would be appreciated if the Examiner would do so in his next communication. Also that the Replacement Drawing filed June 6, 2005 has been received and is accepted.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this Response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 7, 2008

By:



Arthur S. Garrett  
Reg. No. 20,338  
202-408-4091

1568123\_1.DOC